Ham-Policy Digest   Sun, 16 May 93   Volume 93 : Issue 145

Today's Topics:
                            More on no-code
                      Morse et cetera... (4 msgs)
                   uk.radio.amateur newsgroup? (2 msgs)

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Fri, 14 May 93 23:19:49 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!
nntp.Stanford.EDU!umunhum!paulf@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: More on no-code
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <C6xM3H.9z8@ucdavis.edu> ez006683@othello.ucdavis.edu (Daniel D. Todd)
writes:
>Hmmm... I just can't seem to remember seeing that it is the FCC's job to
>*minimize* use of the amateur bands. Yes, when you say it keeps the bands
>from becoming overcrowded that does minimize the use. If you can point
>out where part 97 says that it is the FCC's job to prevent overcrowding
>the bands please post it.

The "FCC's job" is not defined by 47 CFR 97. The powers and responsibilities
of the FCC are outline in the enabling Communications Act of 1934. Those
responsibilities include licensing transmitters, and spectrum coordination to
prevent interference. Yes, that means they can limit the number of stations.

>Ridiculous argument #1:

>If you want to discuss a topic you must PROVE that your idea will not
>cause increased band crowding.

This is a longstanding framework of forensics. The existing system always
has the benefit of the doubt, while new policy must demonstrate both
advantage and lack of disadvantage.

>Ridiculous argument #2:
>The implied argument that the bands are not currently over crowded. They
>are overcrowded at certain times at not at other times.

You've just granted me that we are at or near capacity. You then argue:

>The same way it will be if the code requirement is dropped/relaxed.

There is every reason to believe that this is not true. People who are not
trained in CW will not use it (if you're saying that they would, then little
is lost by requiring it). Other modes require more spectrum, particularly
SSB, which uses 25x the spectrum of CW. Finally, you'd automatically increase
the band population by a factor of at least two. Given that you've conceded
we are at or near the limit, the result would be overload and interference.

>But seriously I meant that the arguements that we need CW to keep out the riff
>raff, call for help when our airplane crashes etc. are ridiculous and I was
>using you in the plural.

We're in complete agreement there; those *are* ridiculous arguments. As such,
I havn't supported such arguments. In painting with such a broad brush,
you've prejudged me.

>Since I haven't been on the 'net for nine years I have no idea what JSMADS
>means.

The Jack Schmidling Memorial Ad Hominem Scale, so named for one of USEnet's
most legendary slingers of slurs.

>I assume it was used to impress upon me that I know much less than
>you do and you are much better than me.

Actually, no, I was trying to impress upon you the fact that your personal
attacks, aside from being uncalled for, are actually pretty lame.

>It must really kill you that I'm part of the same favored group as you.

I'm not too sure what this is supposed to mean, especially since I filed
comments in favor the NPRM that led to the creation of a code-free entry
level license. Your prejudices are showing.

>Please tell me how a lrge number of spectrum users is equivilent to an
>overcrowded movie theatre. I think I'll move my fire extinguisher closer
>to my '530. :-)
>Please make that ridiculous argument #4

Overcrowding historically has lead to interference. Examples include the
mediumwave broadcast band debacle of the mid 1920's under the Commerce
Department, the 27 MHz citizen's band debacle that continues to this day,
and the current international problem with shortwave broadcasting allocations,
to name a few.

>Why is CW proficiency a better way to prove a willingness to learn than
>say... requiring a college degree?

Because it's directly relevant to the problem being addressed, namely,
spectrum scarcity.

--
-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "Just name a hero, and I'll prove he's a bum."
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Col. Gregory "Pappy" Boyington, USMC (ret)

Date: Fri, 14 May 1993 08:59:10 EST
From: anomaly.sbs.com!kd1nr!news@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Morse et cetera...
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert) writes:

> Isn't it funny how this has degenerated to a code versus no-code debate?
> I mean, come on now, folks. We now have a no-code license (Codeless
> Technician), and those who can't or won't learn to code now have a door
> in which to enter the hobby. So, it seems to me to be a moot point.
>
> --Robert WA3J

But it's not a moot point when no-code techs who don't want to learn the
code scream and bitch about not having access to the HF bands. That's
the real issue.

Tony

  Tony Pelliccio kd1nr/ae   "Usenet is like a herd of performing elephants

```
   *!*!*!*!*!*!*!*!*!*!*!*     with diarrhea --  massive, difficult to
    system@garlic.sbs.com      redirect, awe-inspiring, entertaining, and a
 _____    source of mind-boggling amounts of excrement
                               when you least expect it."  --spaf (1992)


-----------------------------

Date: Fri, 14 May 93 11:18:48 CDT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!
zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!menudo.uh.edu!jpunix!unkaphaed!amanda!
robert@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Morse et cetera...
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

ez006683@othello.ucdavis.edu (Daniel D. Todd) writes:


> robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert) writes:
> : Isn't it funny how this has degenerated to a code versus no-code debate?
> : I mean, come on now, folks. We now have a no-code license (Codeless
> : Technician), and those who can't or won't learn to code now have a door
> : in which to enter the hobby. So, it seems to me to be a moot point.
> :
> :  --Robert  WA3J
>
> Actually Robert the point isn't moot.  There are some on the net who would
> like to see the code requirements lowered for the higher class licenses.
> And there are those who would like to see the requirements changed in the
> opposite way.  as far as I know the discussion is not whether or not we
> have a codeless license but rather should we change our license system.
>
> Dan
>


Is it that the Codeless Technician is not satisfactory to these
individuals? It seems to me that the current privileges conferred by this
license go far beyond what the ARRL envisioned. Currently, it's "all
modes on all amateur bands 30 MHz and above (the League suggested 222 MHz
and above). Since code is not required for this license, and it offers a
wide range of frequency bands, again I ask: what is the problem?
In order to gain access to the high frequeny bands (160-10 meters),
knowledge of Morse is required, and from all indications, will continue
to be required. What all this means is, if one wants to talk around the
world, it will require some degree of real effort on his (or her) part
(as opposed to simply memorizing answers from a question pool).
However, the code test is unique: all the answers to the test are sent,
word for word, to the examinee. All he has to do is write them down.
And a license earned through achievement has proven time and time again
to have more value than one acquired through memorization of a "pool."
```

Let me state once again that I am in favor of the Codeless Technician,
and I voiced this opinion to both the League and the FCC. I feel it will
allow individuals to "get their feet wet" in the hobby, and then decide
whether they wish to upgrade to a higher class license. And if all they
want to do is yak on two meters, that's fine too.

I don't believe in "incentive licensing." I feel our license structure is
based on personal need, and not everyone NEEDS to become an Extra. If you
want to talk on two meters, then there is the Codeless Technician. If you
want to chat on 75 meters, then the General Class is for you. I know of
one ham who, for the past decade, has held a Novice, and never upgraded.
Why? All he wants to do is work CW on the Novice portion of 15 meters.

I rest my case.

  --Robert

Date: Fri, 14 May 1993 21:52:47 GMT
From: anomaly.sbs.com!kd1hz@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Morse et cetera...
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

system@garlic.sbs.com (Tony Pelliccio) writes:

>But it's not a moot point when no-code techs who don't want to learn the
>code scream and bitch about not having access to the HF bands. That's
>the real issue.

But they already *DO* have access to HF. It's called 11meters.

MD
--
-- Michael P. Deignan, KD1HZ   /   Since I *OWN* SBS.COM,
-- Domain: kd1hz@anomaly.sbs.risc.net   /   these opinions generally
--   UUCP: ...!uunet!anomaly!kd1hz   /   reflect those of my
-- Telebit: +1 401 455 0347   /   company...

Date: 15 May 93 14:17:09 GMT
From: mnemosyne.cs.du.edu!nyx!rcanders@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Morse et cetera...
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <930514.085910.0J5.rusnews.w165w@garlic.sbs.com> system@garlic.sbs.com
(Tony Pelliccio) writes:
>robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert) writes:
>
>> Isn't it funny how this has degenerated to a code versus no-code debate?
>> I mean, come on now, folks. We now have a no-code license (Codeless
>> Technician), and those who can't or won't learn to code now have a door
>> in which to enter the hobby. So, it seems to me to be a moot point.
>>
>> --Robert WA3J
>
>But it's not a moot point when no-code techs who don't want to learn the
>code scream and bitch about not having access to the HF bands. That's
>the real issue.
>

>Tony

You are still clueless. There is no such thing as a no-code tech. We are
technicians.

Most technicians are not opposed to 5 wpm moris. The real question is
should 13 or 20 wpm morse still be required for higher licenses. Listening
to 20 meters proves that learing morse at 13+ wpm produces lids.

--
Rod Anderson N0NZO | "I do not think the United States government
Boulder, CO | is responsible for the fact that a bunch of
rcanders@nyx.cs.du.edu | fanatics decided to kill themselves"
satellite N0NZO on ao-16 | Slick Willie the Compassionate

Date: Sat, 15 May 1993 15:43:52 GMT
From: wupost!crcnis1.unl.edu!news.unomaha.edu!cwis!pschleck@uunet.uu.net
Subject: uk.radio.amateur newsgroup?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

dave@llondel.demon.co.uk (David Hough) writes:

>I have posted this to a few uk-only groups but as some affected people don't
>get those groups but might be on here, I will put it here as well:

>Is anyone interested in a uk.radio.amateur newsgroup? The rec groups are
>mainly biased towards North America, although frequented by amateurs from
>the rest of the world as well. The new group would be for UK-based issues,

>as well as providing a good place for non-UK amateurs to ask any questions
>they might have about our system.

>As an aside, it is worth noting that there are some aus.radio groups, and
>a few for other countries as well so the idea isn't new :-)

Yeah, including in.ham-radio, which comes from a strange country called
Indiana, where some of the people don't even use Daylight Savings Time :-).

Realize though, that your level of traffic may be no better than that
found in the local radio heirarchies (i.e. almost nil). I say go for
it, and at least give it a chance to fail (or possibly succeed).
Postings like the RSGB Bulletins should probably be cross-posted
(uh-oh, flame-fodder!) to both rec.radio.info and the proposed
uk.radio.amateur group. In light of limited traffic, would it be
desirable to make it uk.radio instead, and encompass shortwave
listening?

73, Paul W. Schleck, KD3FU

pschleck@unomaha.edu

Date: Fri, 14 May 1993 20:54:37 +0000
From: pipex!warwick!qmw-dcs!qmw!demon!llondel.demon.co.uk!dave@uunet.uu.net
Subject: uk.radio.amateur newsgroup?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

I have posted this to a few uk-only groups but as some affected people don't
get those groups but might be on here, I will put it here as well:

Is anyone interested in a uk.radio.amateur newsgroup? The rec groups are
mainly biased towards North America, although frequented by amateurs from
the rest of the world as well. The new group would be for UK-based issues,
as well as providing a good place for non-UK amateurs to ask any questions
they might have about our system.

As an aside, it is worth noting that there are some aus.radio groups, and
a few for other countries as well so the idea isn't new :-)

Dave

@@@
@ G4WRW @ GB7WRW.#41.GBR.EU AX25   @   You think *you* have problems?   @
@ dave@llondel.demon.co.uk Internet @   What do you do if you *are*   @
@ g4wrw@g4wrw.ampr.org   Amprnet @   a paranoid android??   @
@@@

Date: Fri, 14 May 93 23:23:17 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!
nntp.Stanford.EDU!umunhum!paulf@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <C6vq8t.Ex5@ucdavis.edu>, <1993May11.223649.1433@leland.Stanford.EDU>,
<1993May13.073853.19940@ke4zv.uucp>aulf
Subject : Re: More on no-code

In article <1993May13.073853.19940@ke4zv.uucp> gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)
writes:
>Many used to sweat bullets when they had to *lie* on their
>renewal forms about still being able to copy Morse at their licensing
>requirement rate. Fortunately, the FCC deleted that question.

So, are you saying that the number of phone operators would *not* go up if
the requirement was dropped? Remember, even if the proportions don't change
(and of course, they will), you're at least doubling the number of people
eligible to operate HF phone.

--
-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "Just name a hero, and I'll prove he's a bum."
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Col. Gregory "Pappy" Boyington, USMC (ret)

Date: Sat, 15 May 93 06:02:46 GMT
From: overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!
darwin.sura.net!news-feed-1.peachnet.edu!umn.edu!csus.edu!netcom.com!netcomsv!
orchard.la.locus.com!@dog.ee.lbl.gov
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <93132.133819WKOEHLER@ESOC.BITNET>,
<1993May13.082440.20340@ke4zv.uucp>, <93133.145245WKOEHLER@ESOC.BITNET>arwin
Subject : Re: Should auto mechanics learn how to shoe horses?

In article <93133.145245WKOEHLER@ESOC.BITNET> WOLF KOEHLER <WKOEHLER@ESOC.BITNET>
writes:
>
>   There are, thanks God, so many aspects in ham radio to make almost
>   everyone happy if we are all tolerant enough to accept a few simple
>   facts of life: Live and let live.
>
>   73, Wolf.
>   DL3ZBJ, AB6EL, VK6BGV.

It is ironic that this is a pretty good summary of my philosophy.
However, when people, such as myself, point out that CW is much less
important in the scheme of things, in an effort to explain why
the US amateur licensing is outdated with respect to CW, we encounter
all forms of intolerance, we get called names, and we get flames in
our mailbox.

I *do* know CW, I *do not* want anything for free, since I *do* have
my Extra class license *already*. And I still insist that the higher
speed CW requirements in the US add no value to the service. Now, take
a deep breath and be tolerant enough to accept these simple facts of
life :-)

--
 * Dana H. Myers KK6JQ | Views expressed here are *
 * (310) 337-5136 | mine and do not necessarily   *
 * dana@locus.com DoD #466 | reflect those of my employer
     *
 * This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests *

Date: Sat, 15 May 93 06:10:42 GMT
From: usc!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!darwin.sura.net!news-feed-1.peachnet.edu!
umn.edu!csus.edu!netcom.com!netcomsv!orchard.la.locus.com!prodnet.la.locus.com!
lando.la.locus.com!dana@network.UCSD.
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <93132.133819WKOEHLER@ESOC.BITNET>, <C6xALy.1MJ@ucdavis.edu>,
<93133.135221WKOEHLER@ESOC.BITNET>u
Subject : Re: Should auto mechanics learn how to shoe horses?

In article <93133.135221WKOEHLER@ESOC.BITNET> WOLF KOEHLER <WKOEHLER@ESOC.BITNET>
writes:
>
>Sometimes I wonder what some of you think life is all about. More and more
>people seem to take everything for granted nowadays. Ever heard of having
>to work for or to learn something? Rules may be changed, but there have
>to be rules nevertheless. Life without rules is anarchy. Do you want anarchy?

Well, I worked for my ham license, and now I'm working to overcome mindsets
which threatean to keep to keep the amateur service from staying abreast
of modern developments. If the US amateur service does not meet the
chartered goals in Part 97, it will eventually be recycled as something
else. Would you like to speculate what ham radio will be when the lawmakers
figure out we're stuck in 1930?

>So take one advice, old chum: Overcome your frustration, give yourself
>a new objective and learn CW. Learn it thoroughly, then you'll like it.
>And it's not the speed that counts, believe me.
>
>Life   c a n   be fun, and so can CW.
>
>73 and happy days, Wolf.
>DL3ZBJ, AB6EL, VK6BGV.

I'm not sure you are for real. Are you a construct of the SBS gang?

--
 * Dana H. Myers KK6JQ | Views expressed here are *
 * (310) 337-5136 | mine and do not necessarily   *
 * dana@locus.com DoD #466 | reflect those of my employer
      *
 * This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests *

Date: Fri, 14 May 93 23:36:10 GMT
From: elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!
nntp.Stanford.EDU!umunhum!paulf@decwrl.dec.com
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993May11.153343.12666@ke4zv.uucp>,
<1993May11.182530.22198@leland.Stanford.EDU>, <1993May13.081003.20215@ke4zv.uucp>
Subject : Re: More on no-code

In article <1993May13.081003.20215@ke4zv.uucp> gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)
writes:

>CW ops don't fill in bit errors either, or am I wrong that good CW ops don't
>hear the bits but instead hear whole letter sounds?

Yes, but if you get a garble, you 1) at least know what the garble "sounded
like", and given context, that's usually enough information to correct
the garble. Unless you're running a tree code on top of RTTY, you have no
equivalent to the "sounded like" information; in fact, you throw it away.

>Having less spectrum isn't really apples and apples here. Because the
>HF spectrum spans octaves, it's wider in a sense than a UHF band.

Um, no. First of all, only a portion of HF is open to a particular path
at any one time. Secondly , the amateur allocations are quite narrow; if
you go outside those allocations with any appreciable number of users, you

will raise the noise floor for everybody else.

>As to it not being cheap, when I started out in electronics a solid
>state adding machine cost $4000.

Yes, but DSP hasn't seen much of a cost reduction (at least compared to
general processing) since its introduction. The reason is that somebody has
to write the software. Aside from there not being too many somebodys that
can do this, it's not a trivial hack.   So I doubt you're going to see
dramatic reductions in end user cost any time soon.

--
-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "Just name a hero, and I'll prove he's a bum."
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Col. Gregory "Pappy" Boyington, USMC (ret)

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #145
****